

VOLUME 8.

NUMBER 3.

PRICE 1/-.

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for March, 1967

SLICE OF LIFE

The Editor

SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE, RHODESIA

Edward Rogers, S.J.

THE POORER FAMILY

J. M. Jackson

AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH

Vincent Rochford

UPON THE STRICTER OBSERVANCE OF THE LORD'S DAY

H. W. J. Edwards

THE PERSONAL FACTOR

E. L. Way

Contents

Page

129 PRINCIPLE AND PREJUDICE
The Editor

132 UPON THE STRICTER OBSERVANCE
OF THE LORD'S DAY
H. W. J. Edwards

143 AUTHORITY IN THE CHURCH
Vincent Rochford

148 CURRENT COMMENT: SLICE OF
LIFE
The Editor

158 THE PERSONAL FACTOR
E. L. Way

163 SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SERVICE
RHODESIA
Edward Rogers, S.J.

175 INDUSTRIAL ANGLE: THE POORER
FAMILY
J. M. Jackson

184 ANY QUESTIONS?
William Lawson, S.J.

190 BOOK REVIEW

IF YOU CHANGE YOUR ADDRESS:
If you are planning to change your address please let us know at least two or three weeks ahead because subscription lists are made up in advance. Send us both new and old addresses.

CHRISTIAN ORDER is a monthly magazine devoted to the promulgation of Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs. It is published for Father Paul Crane, S.J., 65 Belgrave Road, London SW1, by C. J. Fallon (London) Ltd., 1 Farnival St., London EC4 and 31 King St., Belfast 1, and printed in the Republic of Ireland by The Record Press Ltd., Emmet Road, Bray. Annual subscription: one year, fifteen shillings; in the U.S.A. and Canada three dollars; in Australia twenty-one shillings; postage paid.

Those who previously bought *Christian Order* each month at their church door or elsewhere are advised that the magazine is obtainable by subscription only. The rate is 15/- per annum. Send your subscription please to:

C. J. Fallon Ltd.,
43 Parkgate Street,
Dublin 8, Ireland.

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 8.

MARCH, 1967

NUMBER 3.

Principle and Prejudice

THE EDITOR

AT the end of last year, Wilfred Thesiger wrote two articles in *The Times* giving an eye-witness account of conditions in the Yemen. In his second article, published on December 22nd, he spoke of a great increase in Egyptian bombing raids, despite the truce, in an endeavour to overawe uncommitted sections of the population. "Most of the towns and villages which I visited had been bombed," he wrote, "and many were in ruins." Later, "The Egyptians have used mustard gas and a blinding gas extensively and I saw a number of people who had been permanently blinded by them".

I see no reason to doubt Thesiger's words. He is an authority on the Arabian peninsular, one of its last great travellers, with an intimate knowledge of its people. Moreover, his reports were corroborated shortly afterwards by *The Times* correspondent in Aden. In separate despatches on January 5th and 8th of this year he spoke of brutal Egyptian reprisals against the civilian population of the Yemen, of nearly five thousand arrested Yemenis held in prison under Egyptian custody, of the use of torture against a former Yemeni Minister of Works now in prison and half-paralysed as a result of the savage treatment meted out to him. He spoke also of the bombing of Khamer, an anti-republican town in the Yemen, north of Sana. On January 5th, the Yemeni royalist Minister of Foreign Affairs sent

a message to foreign correspondents in Beirut, telling them of the Egyptian use of poison gas bombs against the people of the Jebel Iyal district of the Yemen, north of Sana, on December 27th of last year. He wrote that "there were scores of victims and many were blinded". He asked for aid and invited correspondents to visit the area. A *Times* leader of January 9th spoke of "full gaols and public executions" in the Yemen and referred to the growing hatred of a regime propped up by between seventy and eighty thousand Egyptian bayonets and forced to rely on brutal repression to maintain its tottering existence.

There is no need to say here that had Britain employed against the population of South Arabia methods remotely resembling those used by the Egyptian forces of occupation against the Yemenis she would long since have been hounded out of that territory and rightly so. In the event, it needed only a whisper of harsh methods of interrogation employed against detainees to send a member of Amnesty International to the spot. He was followed very shortly afterwards by a representative of the British Government. In the event, the published report of the government representative gave unfavourable marks to three army interrogators and praised the restraint shown by British troops and security representatives.

I have no quarrel with the report, only praise for its objectivity and respect for a country whose standards are high, at least in this respect, that it will not tolerate a suspicion of inhumanity on the part of its forces abroad. My real quarrel is with those of my countrymen, mostly on the Left, who are so eager, on the least suspicion of misconduct, to hound to death their country's representatives abroad or those of its allies; whilst turning blind eyes and deaf ears to the very real atrocities carried out, so often in cold blood, by those whose political inclinations are similar to their own. Dawnists have no capacity for objective assessment on a basis of principle; only a series of emotional reactions against those they dislike and whom they brand, in consequence, as reactionaries. Let the Americans drop bombs on a patch of jungle in Vietnam and

they begin to grow restless, let them take action which involves civilian casualties, however indirectly, and they start howling about atrocities. At the same time, they have nothing to say when the Vietcong carry out their nightly butchery in South Vietnamese villages or the Egyptians deliberately and brutally bomb villages and blind villagers in the Yemen with poison gas. They remain silent when British soldiers or their wives and children are shot down in the streets of Aden or blown to pieces with grenades by Nasser's hired assassins; but, let one young soldier break under the tension of his patrol, lose his head and act outside regulations and they are down on him then like a pack of jackals, screaming for his blood. Nasser can get away, quite literally, with murder. A soldier in Aden who shoots too quickly, maybe, in self-defence is likely to be in for trouble.

I am the first to agree that any representative of the British Government who misbehaves himself anywhere should be punished. What I find quite despicable is the selective moralising of so many of those who call for his punishment. From time to time these days the streets of the capital cities of the West are filled with young men and women calling for an end to the hostilities in Vietnam and accussing the American troops fighting there of every kind of beastliness. You will search those same streets in vain for any processions of young men and women calling on Nasser to withdraw his troops from the Yemen or, at least, to stop blinding its people with poison gas.

People who behave in this fashion reveal themselves as quite incapable of objective moral judgment. Prejudice, not principle, is the driving force in their lives. The time for men of good will to withstand their destructive silliness is already long overdue.

In this article the writer traces the rigorist approach to Sunday observance back to the Catholic Church. He notes that strictness does not rule out festivity, and thinks that in the end we shall clamour for the return of our Sundays.

Upon the Stricter Observance of the Lord's Day

H. W. J. EDWARDS

“THE Church is right in the main in being tolerant in the main; but where she is intolerant she is most right and reasonable. Adam lived in a garden where a thousand mercies were granted to him; but the one inhibition was the greatest mercy of all.”

The style of that makes it almost unnecessary to point to G. K. Chesterton as its author. Perhaps, however, it may be felt not a little odd that anyone should attempt a defence of the stricter observance of the Lord's Day with a quotation from a Christian who always insisted that he was no Puritan, for we tend to think of the stricter observance of the Lord's Day as a product of puritanical rigorism. Still, here is Chesterton pointing to the fact that the Catholic Church insists on rules and that what would be called her intolerance is reasonable. Nowadays we have become so used to relaxations—relaxations which I for one find most helpful—that we may be in some danger of thinking that “easy devotion” is desirable or that any criticism of it is tantamount to jansenism.

When, from time to time, I lunch with a diplomat of one of the Latin countries, we sometimes compare the traditions of our two nations. Sometimes he smiles when I describe the long standing tradition of Sunday strictness in my nation, while I find it not a little difficult to restrain my criticisms of the comparative laxity prevailing in his. If I feel that what is badly called “the continental Sunday” is

an abuse, I must be very careful lest I oppose an overtly festive spirit which seems normal in some countries and which naturally bubbles over on Sunday. I must take care to remember the words sometimes attributed to Aquinas (if he wrote the *de Reginine Principum*), "while custom is not law, it interprets a law and has the force of law".

Perhaps I have begun this article upside down. Perhaps I should have started with the law which we call the third commandment.

"This is the Day . . ."

John Bunyan wrote a valuable little tractate on the "Nature and Perpetuity of the Seventh-Day Sabbath" in order to prove that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath. The circumstance within which he wrote it was, as he tells us in a preface, that many of his time had become "entangled with a Jewish Sabbath"—folk who may be seen today under some such title as Seventh Day Adventists. Bunyan's general argument is extraordinarily sound and well done.

Having shown that the law of nature does not command any sabbath observance, he shows that the seventh day was sanctified "unto the rest of God" in His creation. "I gave them my Sabbath", said God under the Old Covenant. But that was a shadow and a figure. Then does Bunyan, for all the world as if he were a papist, argue:

"I find that Paul by authority apostolical takes away the sanctions of all the Jews' festivals and Sabbaths. This is manifest since that he leaves the observation or non-observation of them as things indifferent: 'One man esteemeth one day above another; another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind', writes Paul. By this last clause Paul doth plainly declare that such days are now stript of their sanction, are left to the will and mind of the believers as to whether they will observe them or not."

Bunyan then shows that the first day of the week is the Christian Sabbath which commemorates the "rest" of God in his act of redemption. "This day my redemption was

finished. This day my dear Jesus revived. This day he was declared to be the Son of God. Yea, this is the day when the Lord Jesus finished a greater work than ever was done in the world . . . Shall not his light shine upon this day ? ” A Catholic could not put the matter better, especially in that Bunyan treats the Sunday observance as one of joy.

Strictness and Festivity

To many Catholics there is a virtual contradiction between strictness and festivity. But this is a superficial judgment. A friend of mine writing from north-west Wales tells me he is at present engaged on roofing some cottages with the help of local folk who happen to be well instructed in the making of classical Welsh verse. Offhand, I believe that in order to compose a certain kind of Welsh verse there are some twenty-eight rules which have to be kept. It is strict attention to those rules which produces the pleasure. When the late Archbishop of Cardiff in a pastoral letter of 1957 wrote of “the Welsh Sabbath (sic) our national boast”, several of the faithful told me how disturbed they were. Was he not writing like some rigorist of the Welsh chapel ? The short answer must be that he was. But let us look again at the chapel rigorist at his best. When I was in my teens I lived in a village in Lleyn where almost everyone went twice to chapel and many three times on Sunday. Adults as well as children went to Ysgol Sul (Sunday School). What did we do ? We worshipped God which is necessary. We heard the Word of God, albeit preached outside the Catholic covenant. We were taught the Bible. At the same time we sang—and when we sing we do rather more than sing as the English think of singing. We would all have our hymn books complete with tonic solfa in four voices. We all knew which line each of us would take up. If we enjoyed the hymn, we would sing the last verse again and perhaps again. Now I come to think of it, at the National Eisteddfod at Ystradgynlais some years ago, we sang Faith of our Father in Welsh to a well known Welsh tune after the eisteddfod mass and were compelled by the chapel folk present to sing the last verse twice.

Sheer Theatre

And then the old-fashioned Welsh sermon was sheer theatre. The "hwyl" was and still is to be heard. Exactly how may I describe this "hwyl"? It involves certain cadences and crescendoes and a climax. Sometimes it may be sustained for five minutes. If a Catholic demur,—he may say that this is hardly preaching—I must warn him against the very fault he seems to find in the rigorist. If it is true that my puritanical friends demur at Catholics enjoying themselves while on pilgrimage to Lourdes, we Catholics must be careful not to say that our chapel friends should not enjoy themselves during the "hwyl" of a great sermon.

The non-Welsh visitor who notices the rigorism will not notice the fun unless he is lucky enough to be invited to a Noson Lawen in the evening. The big snag about Sunday rigorism in my country derives from the unfortunate manner in which the strictness of a tradition survives while anglicised habits have penetrated sufficiently to impair the fullness of that tradition.

I apologise for concentrating too much upon the tradition of my own country. I might refer to a not dissimilar tradition in Scotland including that part of Scotland where John Knox failed to extend his influence. One may find as great a rigorism among Gaelic-speaking Western Islanders who hold the Old Faith as among "Wee Free" Presbyterians.

In 1962 The Fellowship of the Lord's Day in Wales—a society often confused with the Lord's Day Observance Society — issued a very valuable memorandum upon the stricter observance of the Day not only in Wales but in England.

It memorialised the systematic presentation of the Ten Commandments as characteristic of old English law, e.g. in Alfred's law, Ethelred's Ordinance of Eynsham (1008) and Cnut's Ordinance of Winchester. It then submitted that the commandments are all in some manner embodied in law and that it is stupid to argue that, because they are "archaic", they should be abolished. The lying witness is condemned by the "archaic" commandment, "thou shalt not bear false witness", and adultery is regarded as an

affront in civil law. "Thou shalt have no other gods before Me" is inferred when someone takes a legal oath. The minute minority which prefers to affirm is given a carefully worded text which does not imply any recognition of any other god.

It then refers to various precedents of pre-reformation times in England. For example, St. Dunstan as archbishop of Canterbury denounced his own king Edgar for hunting on Sunday. Edgar obeyed Dunstan's order to give up the practice. The society, which has some Catholic contributors, is Protestant in spirit yet it is careful to cite such references as that of a 14th century priest who attacked Sabbath-breakers: "they neglect the reverence due to the Lord's Day by devoting themselves to every kind of worldly business on it". After the Reformation the Sunday observance seems to have become scantily observed. In 1580, following upon an earthquake, which in those days was felt to be a divine sign, a special admonition was read out in the New Establishment: "Sunday is spent heathenishly in taverning, tippling, gaming, playing and beholding of bear-baiting and stage-plays; to the utter dishonour of God, impeachment of all godliness, and unnecessary consuming of men's substances."

Always strictly Observed

I myself greatly suspect that one of the causes of fresh legislation upon the observance of Sunday arose from the circumstances that the authority of the Catholic Church had been denied. And I am sure that we shall see this very well illustrated when we look at the special legislation for Wales e.g. Sunday closing of public houses.

The memorandum shows that Sunday strictness in Wales goes back to the earliest days of Christianity in the land. "Sunday was always strictly observed by the then Catholic Church" in Wales. "The observance of Sunday in Wales is not to be found, as some writers assert, in the austerity of the Puritans or the Victorians but in the zeal of the founders of the Christian church in Wales." But there is a special difference between the Welsh and English traditions in that old Welsh law exhibits a striking absence of all

religious regulations.

The reason appears to be that from early times the regular clerisy had such influence that it was powerful enough to keep to its own jurisdiction offences which were "sin" as opposed to "delict". Hence all judicial oaths were under the administration of the Church rather than the civil courts and by the same token perjury was punished by excommunication.

For the same reason Sunday observance came under the administration of the Church. "At no time prior to 1536 (the year when Henry VIII incorporated Wales into England) were Sunday amusements allowed or even tolerated by the old Celtic Church and its successor or by the law itself. In this respect Wales differs materially from England."

"In other Celtic countries the custom of Sunday observance in Wales was embodied in the civil law. The custom and law common to all Celtic countries is still preserved in manuscript form (*Liber Flavius Fergusorum*) in the British Museum. Only tasks of necessity or works of mercy were permitted on Sunday. In Wales the Church imposed penalties and in Scotland and Ireland the civil law imposed penalties."

Do we have to look further for the real reasons for the comparative strictness of Sunday observance in Celtic lands (including Brittany outside the holiday resorts)? It may be said that Ireland is an exception. I am far from sure that this is so. I have met a number of Irish Catholics from different parts of Ireland who deplore Sunday sport. Some of them whom I have come to know well are Gaelic speakers and ardent Nationalists.

Rest for Animals

Henry II on his journey through Wales (after his return from Ireland) ran full tilt into the monastic influenced attitude of the Welsh. At Pencader a very famous Old Man "prophesied" to him upon the Welsh nation at the Doomsday. At Cardiff a less famous Old Man remonstrated with him for daring to ride horse on the Sabbath. When the king shook the old man from the bridle, he had to listen

while the old man called down a curse on his sons. Here the commandment has to do with the Sunday rest for animals. (I believe St. Thomas à Beckett showed the same concern and it may have been in St. Dunstan's mind also.) The third commandment is one that calls upon us to give what rest is possible to working animals. "Nor thy beast" is a prohibition; it is also a command of mercy. When in the Old Covenant we read of mercy and indulgence, we must take special care. It would be a poor interpretation of the New Covenant that what was demanded as of mercy in the Old might be ignored in the New.

Meanwhile let me quote from certain authoritative documents of modern times. "We are deeply grieved to see the manner in which Christians in these days spend the Sunday afternoon. Theatres and public games are thronged to overflowing. But the churches are less frequented than they should be. Things should be otherwise" (*Mediator Dei*, paragraph 161, issued in 1947).

"To safeguard man's dignity as a creature of God endowed with a soul in the image and likeness of God, the Church has always demanded an exact observance of the third Commandment, 'Remember that thou keep holy the Sabbath day'. God has a right to command man to devote one day a week to his duty of worshipping the eternal Majesty. Free from mundane cares, he should lift up his mind to the things of heaven and look into the depths of his conscience to see how he stands with God in respect of those necessary and inviolable relationships which must exist between the creature and his Creator. In addition man has a right to rest a while from work, and indeed a need to do so if he is to renew his bodily strength and to refresh his spirit by suitable recreation. He has also to think of his family, the unity of which depends so much on frequent contact and the peaceful living together of all its members.

Thus religion and moral and physical well-being are one in demanding this periodic rest and for many centuries now the Church has set aside Sunday as a special day of rest for the faithful on which they participate in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the memorial and application of Christ's redemp-

tive work for souls. Heavy in heart, we cannot but deplore the growing tendency in certain quarters to disregard this sacred law if not to reject it outright" (Paragraph 249-252 of *Mater et Magistra* by John XXIII). The following paragraphs from the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy compiled under the Second Ecumenical Council of the Vatican reinforce this teaching: 106, which treats of the apostolic tradition which has given us the Lord's Day, a day of joy and freedom from work, paragraph 35 wherein it is recommended that Bible services should be encouraged on Sundays among other great festivals as well as in Advent and Lent, and paragraph 100 which calls for the celebration of the chief hours, especially Vespers in parish churches on Sunday.

I am attempting not so much to "preach the law" and by implication to suggest that only a strict observance of the Lord's Day will ensure a Catholic against some sin against God as to give some support to traditional mores. I have much in mind the saying of that French vine-dresser that what is wrong with us today is a disregard of manners.

It is less a question of our having to be more careful in our examination of conscience touching our observance of the Day as of recovering social codes of behaviour that will enable us not to bother overmuch about whether we are breaking the law or, what is more ominous, whether it is permissible to break it just a little. Far from my lips are the words of any Pharisee. No need to tithe mint and rue. There are many ordinary Christian folk of my acquaintance who, fortunately, have been so bred up within a sound Christian tradition that keeping Sunday holy is as easy for them as falling off a log.

The Quakers

I myself come of a by no means strict tradition. As a birth-right Quaker I was early made aware that the first Quakers were inclined to resist a puritanical literalness and they tried as hard as they could to give equal honour to all days of the week. The first Quakers were indeed so touchy (if that be the word) about their testimony upon the holiness of all days that they would sometimes make a point of

meeting for worship on some other day than Sunday, especially if it were found that some other day was more convenient. All the same, the Quakers did not make that common mistake of levellers, that of reducing the higher to the lower. They did hallow Sunday even if they hallowed other days.

I recall that my Sundays as a Quaker child were usually happy ones. I was not required to sit through the entire Quaker meeting but attended a little Quaker morning Sunday school. In the afternoon I used to go to another Sunday school and in the evening I would play with a magnificent Noah's Ark, one of the few Protestant toys (I believe that the Jack in the Box is another though its alleged origin is less edifying). It has been remarked by von Hugel among others that Quakers, like Catholics and Jews, make very much of family life. This trait was certainly very strong in my own family circle. One result was that we spent part of the day in visiting relatives, some of whom always made much of me, to my great delight. When I grew older, my father and I used to cycle to Quaker meeting houses several miles away. In my 'teens I was taken to a variety of religious denominational services where I acquired a rough and ready acquaintance with the faith and practice of the main "Free Churches" and of the Evangelical school of the Church of England. At the same time, my father saw to it that I did not forget the special contribution of the Welsh chapel—even in London where I used on occasion to be taken to the Calvinistic Methodist chapel in Clapham Junction.

And then our family produced its own music. All of us played at least one musical instrument and even when radio had come, we still spent part of Sunday evening playing music together.

Dangerously Sick

I anticipate the possible objection that all this is "square" and even dull. I anticipate it by pointing to the way in which the search for "life", which is really a search for distractions from life, has become so extraordinarily frenetic

that society in some of its parts has become dangerously sick, so sick that it is taking refuge in drugs of the category of "soma". Whittier, the American Quaker poet, seems to have anticipated our day in his long poem, *The Brewing of Soma*, wherein he describes how certain Indians brewed this drug in order to receive hallucinatory experiences which would for a season enable them to feel that they had transcended the common earth. The last few verses of that poem have been put into many Protestant hymn books beginning with the lines,

" Dear Lord and Father of mankind
 Forgive our foolish ways."

Now I come to think of it, towards the end of his life G. K. Chesterton gave a radio talk which pointed to the same truth. He showed that what so many called a search for life was really a search for distractions from life. I do not say that there should be no distractions. (Pascal erred here.) The necessary distraction is a relaxation. I myself often find it necessary when looking at some problem to turn away from it in order to look again at it. Here perhaps is this "suitable recreation" recommended by *Mater et Magistra*. It means exactly that. It means an action whereby the human body-soul is re-created for the common task.

But people who disclaim the name and mind of Pharisee want someone to tell them whether this means they may play, say, Sunday cricket or watch Sundays plays on television or take the family out in the car for a ride and a picnic. I cannot possibly answer them. Sometimes, I believe the right answer is not hard to find e.g. when a certain Sunday activity demands the employment of a large number of people.

Just Wage

There remains a question or two upon "necessary Sunday labour". In the pastoral letter of the late archbishop of Cardiff to which I referred earlier (he had composed an even stronger one in Lent of 1947), he tackled this very

matter since it appeared that many workers supposed that necessary Sunday labour was determined by what amount they wanted to earn. The archbishop explained that necessary Sunday labour is not that labour undertaken on Sunday for double pay rather than on Saturday at some lesser rate. It was, in fact, the case that many workers in the archdiocese deliberately offered themselves for work on Sunday rather than work on Saturday.

Strange as it may seem, his definition was opposed by some Catholic workmen. I have spoken, indeed, to several who cannot be brought to believe that a man should not work on Sunday for double pay rather than on Saturday. The word "necessary" refers, they feel sure, to the "necessary" size of the wage packet. But the archbishop was not unaware of this attitude and called on the workers to press for a just wage for a day's work as the right solution. But what a strange circle we have travelled ! When I was a young boy, I heard much angry talk about long hours, though even then hours were gradually being reduced. Again and again in the pre-war years I heard talk of a new age of leisure. Again and again optimistic liberals would look forward to workless week-ends.

But now the freedom has been abused and more and more seem intent on working on Sunday. Lest those who do clerical work feel that they are exempt, those who "unnecessarily" do an extra job of a clerical kind on Sundays (e.g. working in the offices of football pools) are sinning against the spirit of the law. Clerical work is often sheer drudgery and it is really playing fast and loose with common-sense when a man tricks himself into believing that he is keeping the letter of the law when he toils in an office Sunday after Sunday for no other reason than that he wants the extra money.

It comes to this that, while we need Sunday freedom for God's sake, we may shortly be wanting Sunday for our own sake. After the years of decline, there may grow a great clamour: "Give us back our Sundays". But the answer will come. "Give you back your Sundays ? Why, you had them and you threw them away."

THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

The respect for all types of authority has declined since the French revolution. Too many dried up officials have been responsible for the smooth running of a machine, and they are the people who have held authority too often. We have not remembered St. Paul's words: "exercise authority with anxious care" Servile obedience is dead. Exchange of views at all levels, and the winning of minds are essential.

AUTHORITY in the CHURCH

VINCENT ROCHFORD

THE decline in respect for authority which is a remarkable feature of the Western world is the culmination of a long historical process. Authority never recovered from the shock of the French revolution. Every monarchy in Europe was shaken, until today the institution of monarchy is really accepted by the mass of citizens owing to the public image of its occupants. The social revolution has brought the different classes closer, and we no longer look up to our betters. The first authority we meet is our father, and he is a much less powerful figure than he has been for centuries. Democracy is interpreted to mean that we send certain members of a political party to Westminster. Out of these a cabinet will emerge who will effectively rule the country, but rule it as our servants whom we can dismiss when we are dissatisfied with their performance.

All this is a far cry from the day when the king was the Lord's anointed, invested with an almost sacerdotal dignity. Like his subjects, he was subject to the law, acting by divine commission and answerable to God himself for the efforts he made towards the common good.

This was a high ideal, which emerged only after long struggles by the Church to tame semi-barbaric chiefs. It was a noble achievement: yet the record proves that the highest ideals are not proof all the time against men's ambition and pride.

Authority in the Church

The prevalent attitude of scepticism towards authority in our society exists also within the ranks of the people of God. This also is the result of history. The long century of polite disbelief during the Enlightenment with its accompanying criticism of ecclesiastical authority helped to weaken its hold over those within the Church. The apostasy of the masses during the last century meant that the Church was not even heard, much less listened to, in the great industrial cities of Europe. Today the educated profess atheistic humanism, and turn to science for answers to mankind's great problems.

So much the attitude of those outside has contributed to the crisis of authority within. Can those who have exercised ecclesiastical authority be absolved from all blame? I do not think they can. For just as the tyranny of many rulers and their indifference to the good of their subjects invited a weakening of their position, it cannot be denied that authority within the Church has helped to arouse an attitude of criticism.

Weaknesses of Authority

To begin with, the many different activities of the Church obviously need a large army of full-time officials. The Church, insofar as it is made up of human beings, has to have a permanent bureaucracy. It has been well served, its tasks carried out with conscientious, painstaking efficiency. It is the instrument by which the policy of authority is executed. But it would be too much to expect that after several centuries during which an ever growing proportion of the problems confronting the national churches were referred to it for decision, its personnel should not come, unconsciously, to assume that they *were* authority instead of

being merely authority's instrument. The young men drafted into service of the Curia find an established routine which has not failed, and they grow more and more confident in the system. Juridicism is the atmosphere they live in. It is fatally easy to lack respect for the human persons whose situation they are considering and deciding.

A great temptation before all who wield God's authority, as for those subject to it, is to fall into thinking that the actions of that authority are the actions of God himself. This attitude was based neither on mature faith nor on reason, for it has always been conceded that where a religious superior orders one to commit a sinful action, then one is bound in conscience to refuse obedience. In other words, a superior's order is not to be blindly received and obeyed. It is to be scrutinised, the subject must make sure it contains nothing against morality. An admission in itself that God's earthly representatives may be passing on an order contrary to God's will.

The Middle Ages were a period in which layfolk mostly did not argue with the clergy: and this at least as much for sociological reasons as from faith. With the Counter-reformation, the defensive closing of the ranks, this traditional "respect" and submissiveness became a necessity and a religious virtue. It was the mark of the "good Catholic" not to question any decision or policy of his pastor, even less of his bishop. But as we grow more mature and there is more respect for people as persons, this could not continue unchanged, nor would God wish it so. The critical and questioning habit towards secular authority was bound to be carried over into the world of religion. And that is good.

Rethinking

The word "authority" as it is employed in normal non-technical use has many meanings. It may mean the sort of man who often emerges in any group, a man the rest look up to with a certain respect, one whose advice they seek and whose leadership they will follow. It is also used of a man with outstanding knowledge of a subject, he is

an authority on art; or with unusually deep understanding, an authority on cricket. In its deepest sense it approaches nearest its primitive significance of "author", the one who makes or creates some object. In this sense the author of a poem or a play has authority over his work because it is his work and he owns it; and as its maker, may be presumed to have a special understanding of what he has made. It is obvious that in this sense only God has supreme authority over all he has made.

The difficulties begin when he delegates something of his authority to men. They must administer his creation fully conscious of the purposes for which God has brought it into being. This is true of the sculptor, who endeavours by respect for the material he is working on to convey truth to the beholder, a true expression, that is, of his own understanding of an object. It is even more vital for a man with authority over and within the People of God. The little priest in whose charge the great sacramental signs have been placed; more profoundly, the bishop, who has so much more power and responsibility; supremely, the Pope: and under him all the officials who have jurisdiction within a defined sector of the Church's life, who interpret and apply ecclesiastical law or policy in concrete situations. All these men are open to the human temptations of pride, ambition, vainglory, and history books are full of their failures. There is the danger of mistaking routine for tradition in the true sense: of allowing the system within which they have been formed to take precedence in their activities over Jesus Christ—making means into ends, that is; of becoming dried up officials responsible for the smooth running of a machine.

Back to Sources

Here again the revolution within the Church set off by Pope John is having its effect. Many churchmen are going back to the sources in the Word of God for help in reinterpreting authority. Thus men surrounded by respect and pomp as noblemen are becoming more conscious of the *service* in terms of which the New Testament defines authority within the Christian community. They were to be

quite different from secular rulers, "the kings of the gentiles". The word "diakonia" is now much used: it is common in the Acts, and meant something like our "lackey". The first generation deliberately chose words from their own civilisation that were taken from the lower social classes, concepts far removed from power over others, with which to describe Church authority.

An obedience that flows out of a mind won over is more fully human than the passive, blind execution of orders not understood. And to achieve this understanding, the exchange of views between all levels, the "dialogue" now a worn phrase, but how novel and exciting in the days of Pope John! And again as a means towards this regular exchange of ideas, the growth within the Catholic community of new ecclesiastical organs, innovations within the very structure of the Church.

A new freedom will accompany and call into being a new laity, more mature, more conscious of its vocation in the world of men. It is through the new laity (and new clerics) that the People of God will increasingly penetrate and influence humanity.

Catholic Notion of Liberty

"The Catholic notion, defining liberty not as the power of doing what we like, but the right of being able to do what we ought, denies that general interests can supersede individual rights. It condemns therefore, the theory of the ancient as well as of the modern State. It is founded on the divine origin and nature of authority. According to the prevailing doctrine, which derives power from the people, and deposits it ultimately in their hands, the State is omnipotent over the individual, whose only remnant of freedom is then the participation in the exercise of supreme power; while the general will is binding on him.'—Lord Acton in *Essays on Church and State*.

CURRENT COMMENT

Down and out Welsh miners singing in the street in 1931 started Father Crane on the social question. In this article he tells the story of the founding of Claver House in London, Canefield House in Barbados and Silveira House in Rhodesia. The ex-students of Claver House have done magnificently.

Slice of Life

THE EDITOR

MY interest in what is commonly called "the social problem" began thirty-five years ago. The year was 1931; the time, that of the Great Depression. My generation will never forget that decade. It lies deep in our bones. I was three years a Jesuit.

Birth of an Idea

One day in Spring I came on a group of Welsh miners, down and out, singing in a London street to keep their families from starvation. Compassion came to me; on top of it anger, as I realised that what these men wanted was not sympathy, but a job. This was the claim of their dignity, their right as human beings made in the image of God. Now it was denied them and their children were without bread. Could the Church be indifferent to their plight? I had to find out; then do something about it.

Thirteen years later, after four years spent in an intensive study of economics and every other moment I could find devoted to the Church's social teaching, I joined the H.Q. staff of the Catholic Social Guild at Oxford. My days were filled with speaking and writing in every part of my own country and abroad. It was a non-stop sort of existence. Within a few years of beginning it, my thoughts started moving in the direction of what we now call the developing countries. Clearly, they were at the beginning of what was going to be a difficult period of transition. They were moving towards independence; but their trouble would not

stop there. Independence, for Britain's then colonial territories, was not the beginning of the end. It was merely the end of the beginning. Social stirrings would accompany political change. The social revolution in each of these countries would continue long after the political struggle was over and done with. But where and when would the social revolution come to rest? This, I was thinking at the end of the forties, was likely to prove the major problem of our time. The Church had to influence social change in the developing countries. Her relative failure to do so in nineteenth-century Europe had brought misery to millions. Was the same failure to repeat itself in Africa and Asia and South America? Were these countries to work their social revolutions without her or under the inspiration of the great social and political principles which Leo XIII and his successors had given to the world? It had to be the latter otherwise the chaos and misery would be appalling. I determined to try and do something about it.

About 1949 or '50 I established a Mission Fund at the Catholic Social Guild. On its behalf I appealed to members. The money we collected would pay for books and pamphlets on the Church's social teaching to be sent to interested priests and laymen in the developing countries. The response was generous. The money came in. The books went out. Then the letters started to follow the books. Then I began to follow the letters. There were two visits to Malta in 1956, the second a very long one, with a programme of more than seventy-five lectures in ten weeks. After that, a tour of Guyana and the West Indies in 1957. I remember most vividly, during that tour, ten days in Trinidad during which I gave thirty lectures in all parts of the Island, with temperatures near the nineties. I can still feel, when I think of it, the tiredness in my ankles from standing and talking for so long and answering so many questions. They never stopped. I enjoyed it all.

It was inevitable, I suppose, that my next port of call should be Africa. The invitation came for the Autumn of 1958. It was from the Bishops of what is now Tanzania and it had the full support of the Apostolic Delegate. I remem-

ber how I had to postpone my departure until November because a protracted dispute on a construction site involved friends of mine in conflict with the Communists. My friends won.

My first trip to East Africa marked a turning-point in my life. It took me only to Tanzania and Kenya, but it taught me two things. I knew, in the first place, that I now had to give all my time to the developing countries; the real fight was there. I received confirmation, in the second place, that the way to win the fight was through the formation of young lay leaders. It would be their job, as dedicated Christian citizens pledged to self-sacrifice, to work without ceasing in order that, through their influence, the evolving life of the young countries of Africa would come to rest eventually on the only foundation worth having, one grounded in respect for human dignity and freedom under God. What I call the second (social) revolution in Africa had to be won not by the missionaries, nor by the Europeans; but by Africa's young Christian laymen themselves.

This was the idea that set deep in me at the end of 1958 and in the first months of 1959 as I bumped my way over the dirt roads of East Africa to talk with its bishops, priests and laity and speak at meeting after meeting to its people. Young Christian Africa would work its own social revolution. It was for me today to train tomorrow's young leaders, men who would come forward at every range of social life and work without counting the cost for the good of their people. Nobody else was attempting to train them. It was for me to get on with the job. Let me stop talking and begin.

At this point Providence stepped in. At Rome in May, 1959, after returning from my first trip to Africa, I went to call on the Superior General of the White Fathers to thank him for the kindness shown me by his missionaries in Tanzania. It was one of those things; unknown to myself, he was looking for me at the very same time I was looking for him. And why? Because my idea was also his—a leadership-training centre for young African laymen in London. He had collected the money. Would I do the job? My own General agreed and the deed was done.

Within weeks of my return from my first visit to East Africa I found myself Director of a prospective leadership-training centre for students from English-speaking Africa. God had been very good and so had the White Fathers. It was my business now to cash in on the bounty that Providence had placed about me.

Idea into Practice

The decision to open a leadership-training centre in London for young African laymen was taken in Rome in May, 1959. It was ratified, so to say, at a meeting of White Fathers and Jesuits—old and well-tried friends—in September of the same year at the White Fathers theologate at Totteridge. Between those concerned there was unanimity on all points. Particular emphasis was placed on two aspects of the work to be done at Claver House, as we decided to call the new leadership-training centre. In the first place, there was the need to select candidates primarily on a basis of character rather than academic record; secondly, the importance of running Claver House in such a way that students would feel impelled to dedicate themselves to the service of their countries without counting the **cost**. The need, in Africa as anywhere else, was for men of principle in all spheres of public life. Claver House had to produce them. Otherwise it was a failure.

No one realised this more clearly than I did. For fifteen years I had been sweating it out in the social apostolate in Britain. For a good many of those years I had known that the real need was for dedicated men in every field of my country's public life. I had been denied the means of producing them; in the sense that the volume of work I was saddled with made it impossible for me to devote my time to this all-important task. I had seen East Africa, Guyana and the Caribbean, where this same crying need was everywhere apparent. Yet, no-one in these countries appeared to be really conscious of this need, still less, doing anything about it.

I had now what I had formerly lacked in the Catholic Social Guild, the time and the monetary means necessary

to open and run a centre where young men from Africa could be inspired to dedicate themselves to the service of their people, shown the great Christian principles which must be upheld if men are to find peace, and given the techniques necessary to translate principles into practice within the context of contemporary Africa. My men would lead to the extent that they served their fellowmen for the sake of Christ Our Lord. It would be the task of each, when he returned to his country, to make the world of his working day safe for the dignity of all. They would be few; but they would be dedicated and know exactly what they were doing. The effect of such impact on young independent Africa would be profound; but only if the message of Claver House was one of total commitment. Nothing else mattered but that.

This was my reasoning, based on one of the firmest of all my beliefs; that, in the context of today's struggle, quality alone is significant. The future of Africa or, for that matter, any other people in the world, belongs to the dedicated few. Failure to realise this has already cost the Church dear. The interesting thing is that the great majority of us are still unaware of this fact. The few who are aware are relatively powerless to do much about it. They are without a significant voice and, therefore, without financial resources. These are still at the disposal of those who believe in the short-term efficacy of the big battalions. They are grievously mistaken and, as a result, are wasting millions; but that is another story.

Meanwhile, we have fared well at Claver House. A year was spent looking for a suitable property: then, a small hotel was found for sale with all its effects in Belgrave Road, Pimlico, not far from Victoria Station. It suited my purposes down to the ground. It would accommodate a small teaching staff and approximately thirty students—in my opinion, an ideal number, the maximum one can get to know personally in the course of nine months; and how can you train men as leaders unless you know them; unless they can come to you as a friend at any time and put their feet up and talk things through and let you into their

future? Institutions are out, so far as leadership-training is concerned. Claver House is a home. Were it anything else it would fail. It is a place where we do everything together.

The first handful of students arrived—approximately a dozen of them—shortly after, Mass was said for the first time in the House on All Saints Day, November 1st, 1960. Immediately, we had to fit the course together, playing it by ear, so to say, building up a syllabus of lectures and a team to deliver them from friends round about. There was never a dull moment. By the end of the year we had built up together, students and staff, something which we thought would work. There have been improvements and adjustments since; but, basically, the course at Claver House now is the one we built in our first year of trial-and-error, of playing it off the cuff, with the willing and wonderful co-operation of twelve African students whom I number now amongst my best friends in the world. I shall never forget that first year. I learnt a lot, an awful lot.

I write these lines with the sixth course at Claver House behind me. The present one, which was booked out a year beforehand, began on September 26th, 1966. Already more than the thirty places available have been booked for 1967-'68. These facts, I think, speak for themselves. People now take note of Claver House. They do so because they have seen the men it produces. These have done well. I mean this. At fifty-six, I am too old to engage in the childish game of fooling myself. Had Claver House shown no signs of success after two years, I would have got out from under. The work would have gone to another. In fact, it has succeeded. That is why I am still there. Its men have done magnificently—in trade unions and politics, in community development and government service. At the moment, I reckon, we score with eight out of every ten who come to us. That is a high percentage. I know it to be true. There is a Minister of Justice amongst my past students, two members of parliament, a fine, brave editor of a powerful daily paper, the manager of a factory employing 2,000 workers, the second-in-command of a vast national trade union, a field

commissioner for scouts, the head of half a country's community development operations, men skilled in co-operative finance. I have many stories and I receive many letters. I travel frequently to Africa. I know what my men are doing. They have done me proud. Dedicated, generous and honest they are influencing the evolution of Africa at this the most important time in its history. I think the world of my Claver House men. They serve their countries well.

Further Afield

I have never made a fuss about Claver House. I have seen so much in the way of formal openings and then so little come out of what was formally opened. I have listened to endless talk about what needed to be done and then found nothing was done: the net result of so many discussions was the formation of a committee, which resulted only in the postponement of essential action. I decided to be done with all that at Claver House. There would be no talk and, above all, no committees. Claver House would be a place where we did things. It would stand or fall by its results. There would be nothing bogus about it, no straining after effects. Its only endorsement would be the work of its men. If they failed I would get out. Someone else could take over and try his hand. If they succeeded, I would carry on, improving all the time, raising my sights still higher and, maybe, opening other leadership-training centres elsewhere.

The men, thank God, have succeeded as I thought they would. They have gone beyond my hopes. I am intensely, passionately proud of them. Only two days ago an African priest from Zambia called in to see Claver House. He had come, he said, to see the place because he had been so impressed by its past students. I was talking, a moment before writing this, to one of them who had dropped in to see me. "No one," he said, "who has had the training here can act any other way than honestly when he gets back to Africa".

Meanwhile, we have expanded elsewhere. In the late summer of 1963, on my way back to England from Guyana

where I had been lecturing, I went to look at a property on the island of Barbados in the West Indies which was offered as a Leadership Centre to cover Guyana and the Caribbean; later, maybe, it would help meet the needs of Latin America. There was only time for a quick look, for time was short and Hurricane Flora was on my heels as I went over the property. It seemed ideal and I said so. Superiors agreed and, in December of that year, it was made over to the English Jesuits for use as a leadership-training centre. Just over two years later the Caribbean Leadership Centre at Canefield House, Barbados opened for its first residential course on February 12th, 1966. The two years in between had been taken up with the task of reconstructing and adapting the excellent property so generously given to suit the residential needs of twenty-four students and a small teaching staff. The work of reconstruction had to be paid for and I was stuck with the task of raising the necessary funds to cover costs of capital reconstruction, furnishing and, in addition, the operating costs of the first months, including those of the first residential course, which began on February 12th, 1966, and closed on May 21st. The course was a success. (I knew it would be for it was under the direction of my close friend, Father Cyril Clump, S.J., who knows the area well and is, certainly, the most knowledgeable expert I know on labour movements in developing countries.) Thank God, I managed to raise enough money to cover the capital, furnishing and initial operating costs of Canefield House, Barbados. I am negotiating now for assistance with the £8,000 a year it needs to operate to the maximum of its potential. At present, my fingers are crossed and I am in close and constant consultation with my old friend, St. Joseph. He has not yet let me down. He will not do so.

Fourteen students attended the first residential course at Canefield. Eighteen were at the second which was completed in the first week of December, 1966. The word, you see, has got around. The second course, like the first, was for English-speakers. Later this year, I hope we shall begin the first courses for students from the Spanish and French-speaking islands of the Caribbean.

Everything, of course, always happens at once. (I rather like it that way.) In the late summer of 1964, when I was in Rhodesia, the Superior of the English Jesuits who work in that country made over Silveira House, seventeen miles outside Salisbury, as a leadership-training centre for young African laymen and women of that country and beyond. Silveira House had been built a few years before as a Jesuit Novitiate. A generous benefaction had made possible the removal of the novitiate to another property. So, here we were with another centre, generously made over by the English Jesuits to serve a most vital need at a critical time in Rhodesia's history.

Father John Dove, S.J., an ex-Major of Gurkhas who had worked some years as a missionary in Rhodesia, took up residence at Silveira in November, 1964. The place opened for business soon afterwards with an operating capital of £1,000, generously given by the Jesuit Superior of a Mission already overburdened with innumerable heavy commitments. Courses, since then, have been on a week-end basis because of shortage of funds and staff. But the week-end courses have been successful. In the eighteen months up to June, 1966 nine hundred young African men and women, drawn mainly from the Salisbury townships, had felt the impact of Christian principles, bringing hope and courage to their lives at a time when so much else means only frustration and despair. They love Silveira. It stands for them as a symbol of the dignity they know as their most priceless possession.

Meanwhile, Silveira House presented me with a money-raising problem just as Canefield had done. The two establishments needed financing together, which did not make things any easier. So, St. Joseph had to be put to work overtime. So far he has done his stuff. Last January (1966), a silver lining began, for the first time, to shine through the dark cloud that constituted Silveira's financial problem. An appeal-article I wrote, with the kind consent of the Editor of the *Universe*, brought £1,000 in donations from wonderfully generous readers; sufficient to keep us going for some more months. This was the beginning. Then, in July, 1966,

a further sum came, as the result of long efforts, which will make immediately possible at Silveira residential courses and, I hope, a small teaching staff to do for Rhodesia and, eventually, Central Africa as a whole what Canefield has begun to do for the Caribbean.

So, we are on the way now. There is very much to be thankful for. There is, as always, a great deal more to be done. No one knows it better than I. My thoughts, as I close this brief story, are of unbounded gratitude towards all those wonderful and generous people who have helped bring the work of Claver House thus far along its way. The journey is not yet ended. I know I can count on them in the future as I have counted on them throughout the past.

A Factual Survey

The Communist Party Today is a factual survey published last year by Industrial Research and Information Services or IRIS as it is more popularly known. This pamphlet carries a great deal of valuable information. I hope its authors will make a practice of bringing it annually up to date. They would do a great service if they did this. Whilst writing in for this pamphlet readers would do well to ask for a specimen copy of *Iris News*, which appears monthly and contains a great deal of information of special value to trade unionists.

The personal factor enters most of our arguments, and colours most of our judgments. The part it plays must be allowed for, but should not be permitted to dominate our lives or our thinking . . . One good custom frequently corrupts the world.

The Personal Factor

E. L. WAY

THE argument had been furious. And had it not been between two friends, both Catholics, it would have been bitter. Like some arguments, it had begun by ranging over many topics on which there was substantial agreement. Both speakers had agreed in condemning the extremists who made themselves a squalid nuisance in the Church today. But when it came to politics, and the Church's social doctrine, agreement had come to an end. One speaker took the line that only one thing counted: the salvation of the individual soul. And that social injustice would be ironed out in the next world. The other retorted that that was a very comforting doctrine for those who enjoyed the good things of this world, but that it would not cut much ice, say, with the two million on national assistance. "Pie in the sky, when you die," he quoted. And had promptly been accused of being a Marxist. He strenuously denied the charge, and, in his turn, accused his opponent of trying to turn the Church into an inefficient branch of the Employers' Federation. After that there was more heat than light in the argument. The 'Marxist' was further accused of relying too heavily on individual hard cases to the neglect of principle. To which he replied that a constant pre-occupation with abstractions frequently led to a total neglect of, and indifference to, the human being for whom the principle existed. Texts sacred and profane were flung back and forth. Facts were challenged.

Property

Then the idea of property came up. Did the 'Marxist' deny the right of people to own property? Certainly he

did not. But he maintained that the Church's doctrine on property was falsified by its application entirely to the very few who owned it. How could we invoke such a doctrine, he asked, in the defence of the English community where 10 per cent of the people owned 90 per cent of the property? Had not the popes condemned the excessive disproportion between the vast wealth of the few and the miserable lives of the many? Had they not called for a more just distribution of wealth so that "the goods, created by God for all men, should belong to all equitably" (Pius XII)? The argument then took a farcical turn. (Nothing like farce to remind men of their humanity.) A patient dog, sitting inoffensively on the floor, had its tail trod on, and howled. The 'Marxist' was asked provocatively if he wished to lay his hands on the property of the wealthy in his scheme for distribution. And was equally provocative in his reply: "Yes, certainly. They are brigands who have laid their hands on the property of others". It all ended amicably enough by the introduction of the personal factor. The 'Marxist' was told that he was jaundiced in his outlook by his recent experience of unemployment, without any redundancy pay, and without the dole. To which he retorted that his opponent naturally defended a system, on the best of principles, which paid him so handsomely. And it ended amicably, I repeat, because the most offensive things can be said with disarming kindness and charm.

Second Thoughts

When two reasonable men have, by turns, been unreasonable and unfair in an argument, the subject of which means a great deal to both of them, they usually have second thoughts. If pride has entered in, as it often does when victory rather than truth is the object sought, the admissions which should have been made at the time are made afterwards in private. And this is where the personal factor often comes in. It is no argument to say that a man is a 'Marxist', least of all when this is known by both disputants to be false. Nor is it an argument to label a person as an antiquated tory, even if this contains more than an element of truth. Ruling an opponent out of court at the

very beginning is a kind of bluff that seldom works. But the personal factor does enter in. A man's position, or complete lack of position, in society does to a certain extent colour his thought. And this should be taken into account. But it should not be allowed a dominant place in any final summing up. Because it cuts both ways. If a man with two suits, two pairs of shoes, and a couple of rented rooms argues for a better distribution of the world's wealth, his argument cannot be met by an analysis of his possible motives. The reply is always open to him that the defenders of the existing set-up are only defending their own unjust share of the spoils.

Class Distinctions

There is a passage in Somerset Maugham's *A Writer's Notebook* on class distinctions which is worth quoting. He begins by writing that it is hokum to believe that there are no class distinctions in America. "I was asked one day out West to lunch with a woman who, I was told, had twenty millions. I have never seen a duke in Europe treated with such a deference as she was. You might have thought that every word that issued from her opulent lips was a hundred-dollar bill that the guests would be allowed to take away with them. It is true that there is a pretence that one man is as good as another, but it is only a pretence. A banker will talk in the club car of a train to a travelling salesman as though they were equal, but I am not aware that he will dream of asking him to his house . . . Social distinctions in the final analysis depend upon money . . . it is a mistake to suppose that class distinctions exist only in the upper and middle classes of society. In England the wife of a skilled artisan looks upon herself as a cut above the wife of a common labourer and will not consort with her . . . It looks as though the existence of class distinctions is inseparable from life in the social state, and instead of denying its existence it would be more honest to admit it."

Man of the World

Maugham puts the point of view, here, of the man of the world. And perhaps it would be widely accepted amongst

Catholics with certain political affiliations. But what his argument amounts to is this: that what is apparently inseparable from life should be honestly admitted. In the passage quoted if the word 'adultery' was substituted for the words 'class distinctions' we can see where this type of argument lands us. Adultery may accompany men and women in society, it may be inseparable from life in the social state, but it would be an odd Catholic who thought this a good reason for encouraging it as a pleasant diversion. The upholders of class privilege may, perhaps, be up in arms at this passing off of their unamiable vice as the equivalent of adultery. All that can be said in favour of the analogy is that class distinction reduces a man to his function. What a man does for a living is what he amounts to. With carpenters, fishermen and tent-makers prominent, to put it mildly, at the very source of our religion this is an odd line of argument to take. Christ scarcely thought less of a man because he did not have two houses or the best of carriages. He was content with a borrowed donkey. And we can hardly dare to improve on his summing up: a man's life does not consist in the abundance of the goods which he possesses.

The Root

But an abundance of goods is the root of class distinction. If you have money you are worthy of consideration. You are a somebody. If you haven't any — don't waste my time 'brother'. "Get the hell out of here." How such an attitude can be defended by a Christian is entirely beyond my understanding. Perhaps it is here that the personal factor is most powerfully at work. Consider, for example, a child at the most impressionable age, place him in Asiatic surroundings, waited upon hand and foot by coloured servants, and he will naturally grow up thinking that he belongs to a superior race. He will accept the most outrageous behaviour as normal. He may see one of these coloured men violently kicked, or knocked down, and will think nothing of it. (For those who have not experienced this type of behaviour, a reading of Forster's *A Passage to*

India, or Doris Lessing's short novel A Home for the Highland Cattle may achieve a lifting of the horizon.) The early formation of habit and opinion amongst Englishmen, or any other of God's less gifted creatures, towards those of lower social standing is similarly decisive. And without the grace of God, is extremely difficult to overcome in later life.

Child and Soldier

Thinking of the child brought up in Asiatic surroundings, or African for that matter, reminds one of a very contrasted reaction. If a conscripted soldier, a humane and sensitive man, saw the same scene as the child: a coloured man violently kicked, he would be deeply shocked. (If you doubt this ask any friend who went East during the second world war what he thought of the general behaviour of Europeans in those parts he visited.) What makes the difference between the reaction of the child and the soldier? Surely it is custom which has habituated the child to such scenes (matters have been explained to him), and a complete lack of such behaviour in England which shocks the soldier. And if the kicking and beating of workmen in the west is a thing of the past, it is surely not too much to hope that a further seepage of Christianity will prevent the subtler cruelties now frequently inflicted on them. An appeal for further education, a sturdy reliance on it, usually produces a weary smile, or a cynical joke, but it is astonishing the improvements which have been brought about directly through it. The world of the last century as portrayed by the English, Russian, and French novelists is no more. The suppression of the worst side of the personal factor, the untaught child in all of us, will produce further good results.

MONTHLY REPORT

The Principal, Fr. Rogers, S.J., of the School of Social Service, here writes of the first and only institution of its kind in Africa which trains social workers to cope with the isolation produced by the towns, the break up of the extended family system and its effect on Africans; and he shows that the students are trained to run meetings and organise programmes, and have many practical skills such as handicrafts, practical nutrition, child care and hygiene.

School of Social Service, Rhodesia

EDWARD ROGERS, S.J.

MARCH 2nd, 1966, marked a new stage in social work in Rhodesia, as on that day the School of Social Service in Salisbury commenced a new training programme in Social Work. This new programme is a three-year training course leading to the Diploma in Social Work, which is a fully professional training course for social workers. This is the first time that such training has been carried out in Rhodesia.

The social workers who are working here at present are either untrained or have been trained at university colleges in South Africa or overseas for the degree courses and at Jan Hofmeyer School of Social Work in Johannesburg and, more recently, the Oppenheimer College of Social Service in Lusaka. These latter two institutions offered a professional diploma training in Social Work of two and three years' duration respectively. However, the Jan Hofmeyer School had to close several years ago and now the Oppenheimer College in Lusaka has become a constituent college of the new University of Zambia; but because of political and other

factors, it is no longer possible for students from Rhodesia to attend the Oppenheimer College. There is, too, a growing awareness of the fact that social workers should be trained in their own countries in order that their training will fit in with local needs and opportunities. The University College of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, in Salisbury, offers no training in social work, though in the future there is a possibility of the College offering a course in Social Administration. It appears, therefore, that there is a need in this country for training of social workers to a professional level, and this the School of Social Service is now trying to fulfil.

Casework and Group Work

In the United Kingdom, social work training has traditionally stressed the casework approach. This means that it stresses the problems of the individual and of the family, such as helping people in their personal relationship with others, and within the family; obtaining aid for the destitute; marital problems; problems of mental health and adjustment; problems of children; probation work; delinquency. Now, it is very important, of course, to train people who can help the individual and the family in these and other problems. However, in a developing country such as Rhodesia, there are other problems of a wider nature which can best be tackled by what is called the "Group Work Technique". The School of Social Service, adapting its training programme to the needs of the country, has decided to lay equal stress upon casework and group work.

Group work is necessary in a developing country as it is one of the ways of channelling the resources of the community to meet a practical situation and solve it in a practical way. Basically, Group Work Training is training people to help themselves within the group. It is a process whereby the Group Worker has to remain in the background and not impose his personality or his ideas on the group, but to encourage them to develop themselves within their own sphere in responsibility, initiative and character. For this, the group worker must have a sound knowledge of the theories behind group work procedure and also have made

a study of group dynamics from the psychological point of view. He must be conversant with various techniques for running meetings and organising programmes, and have many practical skills such as sports, handicrafts, art, music, practical nutrition, child care and hygiene. Such practical skills as these are often involved in the programme of the group, and are the means through which the group develops, so it is necessary for the group worker to have a fairly sound knowledge of them. This is especially true for the woman group worker who will have to deal with women's clubs in Rhodesia. These women's clubs, especially those in rural areas, form the main channel of further education for wives and mothers of families. Many of these women have had little formal education and have an even poorer knowledge of hygiene and nutrition with the consequent results of malnutrition in the family, and so the group worker must help to put on such programmes as will raise the whole standard of the family in these matters. She must also try to raise the economic standard of the family through such practical skills as dressmaking, growing the right kind of vegetables, and encouraging cottage industries such as basket-making and weaving which will bring in a certain amount of cash to families who are very poor.

Isolation in the Towns

The African in Rhodesia has a great sense of the group. His family group is that of the extended family which includes aunts and uncles, grandmothers and grandfathers, etc., and this in turn belongs to another group, that of the tribe, so the basis for group work is already present. However, for the people, and there are now a considerable number, who have taken up residence in the towns, or away from their own homes, there is an even greater need for group work to enable them to re-establish their feeling of "belonging" which has now disappeared through their isolation from their own group. The feeling of "not belonging" is the root cause of many of the social problems we find in the African townships in Rhodesia. In some ways the situation is analogous to that which arose during the Industrial Revolution in Europe with the mass migration

of people from the rural areas to the urban areas and with the constant breaking of family ties and traditions. As in Europe of that time, people feel isolated, restless and without roots and the norms of social control which formerly existed seem to have no meaning for them. This results in moral as well as social problems. Added to this, there is the inevitable overcrowding in the African townships in a similar way to the overcrowding in Europe during the Industrial Revolution. In these circumstances the group worker tries to help found a group other than the traditional family to help stabilise the people and to give them a sense of solidarity which in turn will help them to become more dependent and responsible citizens playing a valuable part in their own development.

It is only in recent years that casework has been practised amongst the African population in Rhodesia, but this need is becoming more apparent today through the social conditions of the people in the towns as indicated above. Marriages are now subject to the stress of an industrial life and a cash economy to which, hitherto, they were alien. The control of their children, in former times the responsibility of other members of the family, now falls more and more upon the parents themselves, who often feel incapable of exercising these controls without the help of the social code of the rural family. In addition destitution now appears in the townships whereas in the rural areas the destitute person would always be taken care of by his family. Delinquency has also arisen and the need for probation work is apparent. Because of these and other considerations, it was decided that casework must not be neglected in the training of social workers in Rhodesia.

School of Social Service

The School of Social Service was started by the Jesuit Fathers of Rhodesia in January, 1964, and provided a one-year full-time training course in Group Work of an experimental nature. This course was worked out with representatives of many of the social work agencies operating in Rhodesia and comprising training in Group Work Techniques,

Committee Work and Practice, Economics, Ethics, History and Extent of Social Services in Rhodesia, and practical subjects such as Art, Handicrafts, Visual Aids, First Aid, Sports, Book-keeping and Dancing. During their one-year course of training, students were taken on visits to social work projects, to factories, to the Law Courts, to Parliament, to the Art Gallery and many other places of interest. They also did practical field work in clubs, youth organisations, and women's club organisations during the course of their training. Eighteen adult students commenced this course (11 men and 7 women), and 16 completed it. After the completion of this training the students were employed, and are still employed, in social work in Highfield African Township, in Salisbury's Harare Township, in Bulawayo, in Gwelo, in work over a wide area for developing African women's clubs, and in Zambia, one with the Railways Welfare Section, the other helping in Community Development projects. All of these students were African, except one, a coloured girl.

The second one-year Group Work Course started in February, 1965, with again an enrolment of 18 adult students (11 men, 7 women) and 16 qualified at the end of the year. All of these students were African. This course benefitted from the experimental experience of the previous year, and more time was given during the course to the discussion method and a greater amount of field work was obtained for the students. In addition to concurrent field work practice of one afternoon a week with local agencies, the students spent a whole month working under the direction of a qualified social worker. This course finished in December, 1965, and most of the students who completed the course are now working in group work in the African townships around Salisbury and Bulawayo and also in women's club work in Gatooma.

During the course of 1965 preparations were made for the three-year Diploma Course to be opened in 1966. A syllabus committee was appointed which consisted of representatives from many Government Departments and from the main Municipalities of Salisbury and Bulawayo and representatives from the School of Social Service. A syllabus was approved

and a Board of Governors for the School was erected. This consists of representatives from the Jesuit Fathers, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare, and the Director of African Administration from Bulawayo.

Academic Standards

A new development is the erection of an Academic Board for the School to provide an external control over examinations and to maintain the general academic standard of the School. The Board consists of a representative from the Ministry of Education, another from the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare and the Principal of the School.

The standard of entry for the course leading to the Diploma in Social Work is high for Africa, i.e.: five G.C.E. O-levels (one of which must be English Language) or the equivalent in another public examination. However, special provision is made for mature students who have had social work experience and are over 25 years of age. The School is multi-racial in character and accepts adults of all races for its courses. It is also non-denominational as, though sponsored by the Jesuit Fathers, it is designed to meet a national need, not a specific denominational one, and up to now students have come from all the major churches in Rhodesia.

On March 2nd of this year, the School of Social Service re-opened with two courses. One was the one-year full-time Group Work Course which is being repeated for the third year in succession. This has an enrolment of 16 adult students (5 men, 11 women). All of these students, except one, are African; the other is a European. The second course is the major course of the school, that leading to the Diploma in Social Work. This is a full-time three-year programme and opened with 18 students (16 African, 2 European).

The Diploma Course has a fairly intensive course of lectures in Social Casework, Social Group Work, Sociology, Psychology, Economics and Ethics. The lectures take place in the mornings whilst the afternoons are devoted to the more practical part of the course such as Committee Prac-

tice, Handicrafts, Health and Hygiene, Nutrition, Art, Sport and Visual Aids. Every Saturday morning is devoted to Seminar work and other periods are devoted to the discussion method to enable the students to relate their academic subjects to practical situations. One afternoon per week the students go on visits to social work projects in the African townships, in the European area, to industries, agricultural developmental projects, art projects, Law Courts, etc., and they take part in running a sports programme for a Community School. This programme will continue for the first year.

A new development is the establishment of a Social Advice Centre at Harare Hospital. This Advice Centre is run every afternoon by the students to give them practice in interviewing and helping people and to provide a much needed service for the African Outpatients and visitors attending the Hospital.

Field Work

In the second year of their training the students in the Diploma Course must spend the first 14 weeks of the year away from the school in practical field work. Half of them will be doing casework, and the other half group work in Salisbury, Bulawayo, Gwelo and Blantyre, Malawi. Each student will be supervised in the field by a qualified social worker. The ideal is to have one student per supervisor, but if this is not possible there will be at most two students per supervisor. It is the supervisor's job to instruct the student in the work in hand, to have frequent meetings with him, to read his reports, to help him to assess the situations and to report back to the School on the student concerned. Upon return from field work practice a great proportion of the time of the subsequent term will be spent in re-assessment and re-examination of practical situations that arose during the field work in order to help students evaluate the situations and prepare themselves for the future. Further academic work will take place but now more stress will be given to the problems that one will meet in the field. In the third year students will attend school for the

first term for more advanced work and then will spend an extended middle term (14 weeks again) in a field work placement. Students who did casework in their first field work placement will now be given a group work placement and vice versa. The same procedure will be followed as in the second year, and upon their return to school, further re-assessment will take place, and then revision for the final examinations which will be looming on the horizon.

On 12th December, 1966, the first Seminar for field work Supervisors took place at the School of Social Service. Supervisors attended from the following social work agencies: Salisbury Municipality, Bulawayo Municipality, Social Welfare (Government), the Ministry of Health (Medical Social Work). The main object of this seminar was to increase co-operation in training between the School and the various social work agencies and to help establish a uniform assessment of students' field work. The field work supervisors are a most valuable part of the training system and the School depends a great deal upon them for their intensive work in supervising the students' practice in the field.

Self-help and Help

The School itself is an example of self-help as resources have always been severely limited, and a great amount of make do and mend has to be practised in which the students take their full share. This again, we feel, is an important part of the training, as a social worker will never have all the equipment he requires at hand, and must be prepared to either find means of obtaining it or to set to himself and make what is required.

Much help has been given to the School by the Dulverton Trust in the United Kingdom who have helped with salaries for the first two years and are still helping the School to some extent. Help has also been provided by the Catholic Church, the Ministry of Education, the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare and a number of local organisations who have provided bursaries for the students. High hopes were entertained of obtaining help from the United Nations for this year's extended programme, but owing to the political

situation this and other sources of aid from overseas have become virtually inaccessible. But it was decided to carry on nevertheless and to keep expenses down to the minimum. The Ministry of Education has granted loans to the students attending the three-year course, and this has made it possible for most of the African students to cover their major expenses for the three years. They must repay these loans after completion of their training.

The School has been operating for the past two years in the premises known as the old Morgan High School in Salisbury Street, Salisbury. These premises were a former school for Coloureds and Asians, and, upon a new school being built for them, was made available for adult education by the Federal Government. The school buildings are in a European business area and because of this, in October, 1965, the School of Social Service was given notice under the Land Apportionment Act to leave the premises as there were Africans amongst the students. But after a long series of negotiations, permission was finally obtained from Government for the School of Social Service to remain in these premises to run Social Training Courses in Adult Education. The School premises belong to Government and the School of Social Service is being allowed to use them on a lease.

Residential Accommodation

Another form of expansion this year, which entailed additional expense, was the opening of a Hall of Residence for students. After long negotiations with the Ministry of Local Government, premises in Westwood, the only officially multi-racial residential area in the Salisbury district, were obtained on lease with option to purchase. This property consists of a large house, some outbuildings, and a guest cottage on about 5 acres of ground, and it is some seven miles from the centre of Salisbury. The property had been empty for about three years and a great deal of vandalism had occurred—doors were missing, taps and geysers stolen, piping burnt and wrecked, and electrical installations in a dangerous state. Essential repairs, including the whole

electrical re-wiring of the premises, the installation of showers, extra washing facilities, etc., though kept down to a minimum, have cost a fair amount of money. However, it was absolutely essential to have residential accommodation for students, especially those embarking on the three-year course, as the only other alternative accommodation available for African men was in the men's hostels, in Harare, where up to 600 men are accommodated in a huge block, five to a room, with few facilities for recreation and little privacy. So at the beginning of March the students moved into the new hostel accommodation along with the builders, plumbers and electricians who were still working on the premises. On account of our poor financial position the accommodation is still of rather a temporary nature, but at least the essentials are there and the students have some rather beautiful gardens on the hillside in which to find peace for their studies. This Hall of residence is known as Aston Hall after the late Aston Chichester, the first Archbishop of Salisbury, one of the best-known people who have lived in this country, and one who has indeed made a most substantial contribution to the Christian way of life in Rhodesia. To cater for the increased intake for next year a new dormitory is in process of being erected at the hostel and we are pleased to record that a grant of £5,000 has recently been approved by the Catholic Fund for Overseas Development, for the Westwood property. We are also hoping to obtain assistance from the Rhodesian State Lotteries Trustees for the hostel accommodation.

The Staff

The present staff of the school consists of the Rev. E. W. Rogers, S.J., Principal and lecturer in ethics and social problems, Mrs. J. D. Kirkman, B.A. (Soc. Sci.), lecturer in casework and group work techniques, Rev. Sister Mary Aquina, M.A., Ph.D., lecturer in sociology, D. H. Mhambi, B.A. (Soc. Sci.), Diploma Social Work, lecturer in economics and case work, and John Fraser, lecturer in Group Work Organisation, practical subjects and committee work, who has been with us since the inception of the School and is a

tower of strength in all the practical aspects of social group work training. Mr. D. H. Mhambi, who has had many years' practical experience in social work in Rhodesia, and, being an African, is closer to the problems of his own people, has been seconded to the School through the generosity of the Anglo American Corporation. In addition to the above, there are nine guest lecturers in Psychology, Sports Organisation, Social History and Administration, Nutrition, Art and Drama, and Health and Hygiene. This latter illustrates a point well worth underlining: that of a tremendous amount of help and co-operation that has been received by the School over the past two years from people in Social Work and allied professions in Salisbury. Many of these people have given up much of their time lecturing at the School, conducting examinations and helping with their advice. Some of these lecturers come in their own time whilst others are seconded by the Municipality of Salisbury, the Ministry of Education, and the Ministry of Labour and Social Welfare.

Even while in training the students also make their own contribution. Last year the students helped in a survey being run in the African townships in order to help in the pioneering work of establishing an I.Q. standard for African children. This year the students are helping the Freedom from Hunger Committee by surveying food prices paid by African families in order to help the committee draw up a low cost nutritious food budget. A further development in this field is the establishment of the Social Advice Centre at Harare Hospital as mentioned earlier.

In addition to the professional training courses, the School of Social Service has been active in other fields during the past two years. It has provided part-time courses for people working in voluntary or statutory social welfare organisations to help them further in their work. It has provided lecturers and helpers for other training courses run by various organisations especially those in the field of women's club work. It has assisted in the training of Credit Union personnel and its staff has visited other areas of the country to run or assist in training programmes for social work and youth work. It has assisted in many of such activities in

spite of its slender resources of staff and finance.

African Teenagers' Camp

One of the most interesting projects developed by the School of Social Service is that of a Youth Camp for African teenagers, and this has now become an annual affair. A group of 50 teenage boys and girls is taken away to a mission in a suitable area for a week's camp and the students from the School of Social Service go along to help run the Camp as part of their training programme. The training consists in running a sort of abbreviated Outward Bound experiment for the youngsters in mountain climbing, sports, camping, and physical training. For the youngsters from the towns it provides a well-earned holiday, and their response is very enthusiastic; and for the students we have found it to be a very good training ground for initiative and self-reliance. Another development that has taken place is that of the Salisbury Youth Service which the School of Social Service initiated in the Salisbury district. This is a programme in which senior students of all races from secondary schools take part in programmes of helping the under-privileged. Such students have helped in hospitals, old people's homes, children's homes, mending toys for children, educational projects, etc. In addition a request came from these young people themselves for a training session and in 1965 a three-day training course was held at the School of Social Service at which 60 teenagers from the senior forms in high schools attended.

The number of applications for the 1967 course has been rather overwhelming. We have had over 200 applications for the three-year Diploma Course though we shall only be able to have an intake of 24. One encouraging factor is that there is more interest being taken now by the European community in this form of training which will make it possible for us to have a more racially mixed group of students.

INDUSTRIAL ANGLE

Poverty among lower-paid workers with families is a fact. In this article Dr. Jackson considers ways and means of ending this scandal. He compares the family allowances paid here with those paid in France, considers the possibility of a means test, and a national minimum wage, and thinks that on the whole the family allowances ought to be increased, and extended to the first child; and that they should be paid here, as in France, by the employers, an equalisation fund easing the undue burden which might fall on some employers.

THE POORER FAMILY

J. M. JACKSON

THE subject of poverty among the families of lower-paid workers has attracted increasing attention in recent years. I have referred to it during the past year in several of my articles in this series and in much greater detail in one in the *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*. The plight of these families has also been investigated by Townsend and Abel-Smith in *The Poor and the Poorest*, and the Family Poverty Group has been pressing the government to take steps to close this very serious gap in our welfare state. There are now indications that the government has been convinced that the need for action is urgent, and it now seems likely that some measures will be taken fairly quickly, most probably in the April budget.

The Place of Family Allowances

Almost certainly measures to help these low income families will take the form of increased family allowances.

What is not so certain is *how* the government will find the money needed to pay these increased allowances. Whatever means it chooses, somebody will be dissatisfied. It is important, therefore, that we should look carefully at the role family allowances and income tax reliefs for families with children ought to play in our social set-up.

Family allowances in this country are niggardly by comparison with those paid in a good many countries. In France, they might double the take-home pay of a worker with a family of three children, whereas in this country they would represent only 18s. a week compared with an average wage in manufacturing industry of over £20 a week. A good many appear to regard family allowances as the least justified of the social benefits introduced in the post-war years. In any discussion of family allowances, one is almost certain to find somebody who will argue that the money is spent on beer and cigarettes for the parents and is not needed for the welfare of the children.

This disregard for the very real problems of family poverty contrasts strangely with the sympathy that is shown towards the difficulties of the aged. There is every sympathy for the single pensioner trying to manage on £4 or £5 a week, or the couple with an income of £6 to £8 a week. Yet many of those who indignantly demand that something should be done about the plight of these pensioners are oblivious to the difficulties of those who have to bring up a family on a wage of perhaps £10 a week. A man earning £10 a week will get in addition 28s. a week in family allowances, though against this we must set something like 13s. a week National Insurance contribution. He will have a total net income of about £10 15s. on which to support his family. If a retired couple cannot reasonably manage on an income of £6 or £7, how can a working man be expected to maintain a reasonable standard of living when he has roughly half as much more on which to feed another four mouths and clothe four children? When allowance is made for the additional expenditure which a working man is bound to incur (extra wear and tear on clothing, fares to work, meals at work, union subscriptions), it is obvious that the low-paid worker

with a family is in far worse position than the couple with only a retirement pension.

Where such real poverty exists among the families of low-paid workers, there is clearly a need to take urgent measures for its relief. The more difficult question is what form the relief should take. Should family allowances on a bigger scale be subject to a means test, or should supplementary allowances (the old National Assistance) be extended to working men as well as the unemployed and sick and retired who are in need? Or should increased allowances be extended to all, even if this were accompanied by some adjustment in the present system of income tax reliefs for dependent children?

A Means Test

Any kind of means test is unpopular to-day. Perhaps this dislike of the means test has been carried too far. If one is contributing to an insurance scheme of some kind, whether privately or state-run, one can draw benefit if the risk insured against materialises. Moreover, there is no reason why this kind of scheme should be thought to undermine self-reliance. Because sickness, unemployment and the like do not affect everyone in exactly the same degree, the individual can only provide against these risks by combining with others in some kind of insurance scheme. Where, however, it is not a case of drawing benefit which one has earned by the payment of a contribution at a rate which has been determined by a proper actuarial calculation of the risk involved, it is a different matter. In the last resort, society must assist all who are in dire need. There is, however, no duty on society to assist those who are not in dire need, unless it is through insurance schemes which enable them to *earn by their own appropriate contributions* the right to a measure of help.*¹ Part of the reluctance of people to apply for National Assistance was a praiseworthy desire to stand on their own feet and not to ask for what

*¹The extent to which the state should run such insurance schemes as opposed to fostering the development of schemes by other agencies is a separate question which need not be considered here.

they regarded as charity. Much of the opposition to a means test is not inspired by this belief in self-reliance. Rather it involves the handing out of benefits to all, regardless of need to avoid the alleged indignities of a means test: or the willingness to accept charity so long as no questions are asked.

We should not, therefore, rule out a means test automatically. The payment of bigger allowances to all families should only be contemplated if a reasonable case can be made for this, not merely to avoid a means test for those in need. To decide what level of family allowance is necessary can only be answered when we have considered a number of wider issues.

A National Minimum Wage

An argument that we need to consider very carefully is one that goes like this. If we tolerate low wages but give generous family allowances so that low-paid workers with families do not suffer serious hardship, we are encouraging employers to go on paying these very low wages. Would it not, therefore, be better to prevent the payment of very low wages rather than to supplement them by generous family allowances? There is undoubtedly something in this. On the other hand, it is quite unrealistic to think that it is possible to enforce a national minimum wage that would make it possible for a family with, say, four children to live decently. National Insurance gives a married couple £6 10s. a week, whether sick or retired or unemployed. Can it seriously be maintained that it is possible to keep a family of four children at the same standard of living unless its income is almost double that of the childless couple? Given that a working man would have to pay his contribution towards his National Insurance stamp, and incur certain other expenses, we would need a minimum wage in the region of £14 a week, and this would still not cater for the needs of larger families.*²

²*I am assuming that this argument is pushed to its logical conclusion and all family allowances are abolished. If the objection is confined to increasing the allowances but the present ones can be kept, the minimum wage necessary would be correspondingly lower.

A national minimum wage of the order of £14 a week is scarcely practicable. If the low-paid workers were concentrated entirely in certain industries, there would at least be some prospect of forcing wages up without permitting other industries to use the change in relativities to claim comparable increases. Although there are industries where average wages are low, I would suspect that there is also a proportion of low-paid workers in a good many industries, and that the enforcement of any minimum wage would lead to adjustments for a good many workers who were not initially below the minimum in order to maintain a satisfactory wage structure with appropriate differentials for skill and responsibility. The resulting increase in the total wage bill would be far beyond any conceivable increase in productivity or any reasonable squeezing of profits, and would therefore lead to serious inflation.

This is not to say that we should take no account of dangers of subsidising inefficient enterprises and industries by means of family allowances. This danger arises in Britain because family allowances are paid for out of general tax revenues by the state. The danger does not arise in France, where employers are required to pay family allowances, and pay an appropriate levy into an equalisation fund.*²

Family Allowances and Tax Reliefs

One of the arguments that has been used in favour of increasing family allowances to the poorer families at least is that the state already gives much more generous assistance to the families in higher income groups through income tax reliefs. They have even argued that it would be possible and not unreasonable to increase family allowances for all and to reduce the present allowances given for tax purposes, even to the extent of reducing the total net benefit to the wealthier families. This kind of argument is

²*The purpose of the equalisation fund is to ensure that no undue burden is placed on an employer whose labour force has a high proportion of men with big families.

typical of a good many loose-thinking tax-happy socialists who seem to think that man was born into this world to pay taxes and that anything which reduces the taxes a man has to pay is bad. We might just as well say that the state is heavily subsidising a good many single men and women and childless couples in the low and middle income ranges because it does not tax them as heavily as men and women and couples with bigger incomes. We are supposed to have accepted the principle that people should be taxed according to ability to pay. People like Professor Titmus, however, seem willing enough to apply this principle to initial differences in income, whether earned or unearned, but are unwilling to accept that allowances for children and other dependents are part of this process of determining a just tax burden in relation to ability to pay, not generosity towards families with children.

The present income tax allowances are by no means generous to families with dependent children. Admittedly, for a man paying tax at the standard rate of 8s. 3d. in the pound, it represents a reduction in tax of something like £47 a year or 18s. a week. This may seem generous by comparison with the Family Allowances of 8s. for the second and 10s. for the third and subsequent children, but this is not a proper comparison. However big a man's income, he gets a tax allowance that is worth about 18s. a week, and this will only go a small way to enabling him to maintain the standard of living which is customary in his own social class. A married man with an income of £900 a year (roughly £17 a week and so below the national average earnings) will have a spendable income after tax of £795 whilst a married man with four children will have £973, about 21 per cent more. Can it seriously be claimed that a man with four children and only one fifth more income is not seriously worse off than a childless couple?

It is about this level of income (from about £17 a week up to about £26) that the man with four children derives the maximum relative benefit from the combined effect of tax reliefs and family allowances. As income falls substantially below the national average, the benefit from these

sources is reduced both absolutely and relatively to the childless couple as the rate of tax payable falls. As income rises substantially above the national average, the absolute benefit remains the same (until the surtax range is reached, at over £5,000 a year on earned income) and the total benefit therefore falls relatively to the tax free income of the childless couple.

One could, of course, look at the matter another way. We could try to think of families of different size with the same initial income per head, and ask whether the tax burden per head is the same for the different sizes. This is not very easily done, however. A child does not necessarily add proportionately to the claims on the family budget. In making a calculation of this kind, should we count the child as a third or a half or two-thirds of a person? In fact, the cost of keeping a child may vary a great deal between birth and leaving school perhaps at 18. Any calculations of this kind must therefore have a very wide margin of error. My guess is that looked at in this light, the present tax and family allowance structure is about right, except in so far as it permits real poverty at the very bottom end of the wage scale.

This approach is a false one. Take the case of a married worker earning about £17 a week, and paying about £2 a week in tax. Everybody assumes that he is paying too much tax; or that everybody even is paying too much tax and the government ought to cut its own spending. Forgetting this kind of argument, however, let us assume that the childless couple can reasonably afford to pay £2 a week in income tax. For the sake of argument, let us assume that for budgetting purposes, a child can be counted the equivalent of half an adult. This means that a professional worker with £1,800 or about £34 a week would, with a family of four children, be regarded as having the same income per head before tax or family allowances as the childless couple with £17 a week. It might be thought fair, therefore, if this household of four "persons" (adult equivalents) were to pay £5 a week in tax. In fact, they pay just over this. When we allow for the offsetting of tax payments by family

allowances, the professional household is paying only about £3 a week in tax.

In making this kind of comparison, we must remember that a professional man, married, without children and earning £1,800 would have £1,400 to spend. It is his ability to spend that will, in large measure, set the customary standards for workers of this class, and the man with four children, who will have £1,650 to manage on will not find it possible to maintain anything approaching this standard of living. It is being increasingly recognised that poverty is essentially relative. People feel poor, and are poor if their standard of living is appreciably below that of the community in which they live. Increasingly people are arguing that pensions and supplementary allowances should keep in step not merely with the cost of living but with the increase in average earnings. But if this is so generally, it must also follow in the particular case that households with dependent children will feel poor when their income is insufficient to enable them to maintain the standard of living that is usual among other people of their own kind.*¹

What kind of Policy ?

The first essential of any new policy is to provide help for the families of workers at the bottom end of the wage scale, where real poverty is all too common in our increasingly affluent society. An increase in family allowances, perhaps extending allowances to the first child, is clearly desirable. This would help the families of the low-paid workers, and would improve their lot also when the bread-winner was out of work.*² We have seen that there is a danger that undue supplementation of wages might facilitate

*¹This problem is probably most acute among manual workers. A skilled worker may reach his peak earnings in his early twenties, before he marries, and his standard of living will fall steadily as his family increases in numbers and age, until he again enjoys considerable prosperity when they are finally grown up and off his hands. For the professional man, the arrival of a family is perhaps less of a blow to his standard of living because his earnings normally tend to increase steadily over a much longer period. The professional man will still be worse off than his colleague on the same level of pay but with fewer children, but at least he may not have experienced an actual fall in his own standard of living.

the continued existence of inefficient firms paying very low wages. This danger could, however, be overcome, either by the French system which makes the employer carry the cost of family allowances or by minimum wage legislation. The latter course of action, however, need not try to force wages up to a level intended to be sufficient for the support of a fair sized family. (Such measures would fail, anyway, since even if real wages could be forced up, the benefit would be shared by the single man and childless couple, and they would thereupon set a new standard, judged by which families would still be in poverty.)

There are several ways in which the money could be found for this purpose. Reduced benefits to families in higher income groups has been suggested, but the main argument of this article has been that help for families is very limited anyway at all income levels. If all are to receive increased family allowances, it may, at least initially, be necessary to reduce tax reliefs to wealthier families so that their overall position is unchanged. It will then be for the Chancellor of the Exchequer to try and find where best to lay the tax burden. It may be that the extra burden will fall primarily on the single person and childless couple at all income levels, or on the wealthier taxpayers generally, both those with and without family responsibilities, or some combination of the two. The position is, of course, greatly complicated by our already high level of taxation. For this reason, there might be very great advantages if we could shift the payment of family allowances to the employers, introducing equalisation funds to ensure that no undue burden fell on a particular employer because of the composition of his labour force.

**Supplementary allowances are intended to provide a certain minimum standard of living for all in need. There is, however, a qualification that a person shall not have his income brought up to more than it would normally be when he is working. Family allowances, if increased, would give many families bigger incomes when the man is working and therefore entitlement to bigger benefits when unemployed, etc.

What is the point of frequent confession ?
Do the laity have to offer the same
intention as the priest when he says Mass
for a special intention ? Am I a heretic
in believing in evolution and in the bible ?
Christian culture ? But weren't the Greeks
the most cultured of all people ?

ANY QUESTIONS?

WILLIAM LAWSON, S.J.

What is the point of going to frequent confession
when either you say the same thing each week or
you can't think of anything to say ?

THERE is no point, so why do it ? Or, at best, the point
is hard to find. If there is one, it is hidden in that
recital of the same tale over and over again. Such a reiteration
could be as meaningless as having nothing to say; but
it could be a surface sameness that covers a lively faith,
hope and charity.

What should "confession" be ? It should, first of all, be
called, and be in fact, the sacrament of penance. To call
it that is to remind ourselves that the confession of sin is
only one part of a sacrament that enables us to learn and
express sorrow for our sin and so to grow in love of God.
Just to do regular book-keeping and to rush off to pay our
debts for fear we should land in prison, or to go round dust-
ing our conscience with a scrupulous or houseproud purpose,
is to turn the sacrament into a selfish system of accountancy
or housekeeping. The sacrament of penance should be a
meeting with Christ, to whom we go because only he can
forgive our sins and because we regret our responsibility for
his sufferings. The meeting should be a meeting of friends
which is to be continued as a closer companionship in the
union of the Eucharist and in our whole way of life. Absolu-
tion is an act of God's merciful love, and the penance should
be a share in Christ's redemptive sacrifice.

Examination of conscience ought to be especially about our love of God and of his children, and it ought to be so done as to help us understand God's love for us and the response of love we should make. If "the same thing each week" is part of an effort to love God, it is a real meeting with Christ.

If a priest offers up Mass for a special intention, do the laity present have to offer for the same intention, or can they have their own ?

AS you know, it is Christ our Lord who offers the sacrifice of the Mass, and his "intention" is the same as the intention of his life, death and resurrection—to offer himself to God the Father, on behalf of the whole human race of which he is the head, in sorrow for sin, in love and in service. The redemptive purpose and effect of the Mass are implied in the very nature of sacrifice and are expressed in many of the liturgical prayers.

"Special intentions" are details of that large intention. They can be declared solemnly, as in Masses for the dead, or in parish notices about sick parishioners and anniversaries of death; and they can be privately formulated by those offering the Mass—priest and people—in company with Christ, as in the intervals of silence during the commemorations of the living and the dead.

All those "intentions" are known to God, and they receive his answer. They are prayers, and prayers are always heard. They have the particular value of being joined to the prayer of Christ in his sacrificial worship of the Father. It is a praiseworthy and effective practice to remember those we love in our loving relationship with God; but it would be irreverent nonsense to try to divide the benefits of the Mass according to some human estimate of priorities in intentions. The fruits of the sacrifice are not property to be reserved by purchase or influence. Wealth can secure a great number of "intentions" for itself, but it cannot buy God's blessing.

Then why Mass stipends ? Apart from the "intention" that they reserve, they are for the support of priests. It

would, perhaps, be less misleading if that support were given some other way.

I believe in evolution. Am I a heretic, although I believe also in the Bible? I think I can believe in both.

So you can! So on the face of it you are not a heretic. It would, however, be a help to clarity of thought if you were to use words like "believe" more carefully. Your acceptance of the truths of the Bible is on a different ground from your acceptance of the theory of evolution. You are enabled by God to know the Church as the guardian of his revelation; and what you know on her authority you know by divine faith. Evolution, although you take it on trust from scientists, is a matter not for faith but for sight—and seeing is not believing. You do not "believe" in evolution, but you possess scientific evidence that justifies your holding the theory.

Scientific investigation has discovered facts which show an evolutionary progress of animal life from simpler to more complex forms. The facts indicate the probable origin of man in lower animal forms. The line of descent has gaps—missing links—and the exact line is not known: but it is reasonable to admit that the evolutionary theory includes man. The account of man's origin in the book of Genesis can be read straightforwardly as a summary of an evolutionary process—"The Lord God formed man from the dust of the ground". You need to be careful not to use the evolutionary theory in an unscientific way. There are materialists who attribute everything in man to material change, and they deny that man has a spiritual soul. That view is contrary to reason and, of course, to revelation. The Church teaches us that the soul is directly created by God—"he breathed into man's nostrils the breath of life; and man became a living being." That truth is decisive in limiting the sheer speculations that can arise out of the theory of evolution.

Why is it said that Christianity brought culture, when the pre-christian Greeks, Romans and Egyptians are the most cultured people we have had so far? I was told this once during a religious lesson, and again during a lecture given by a priest.

WHAT you were told seems to me to be true; but it needs extensive discussion of the meaning of culture, and then an assessment, according to an agreed standard, of the cultures of Greeks, Romans, Egyptians and Christians.

Culture is a quality of human society resulting from the cultivation and development of human talent. Human beings discover themselves through their presence in the material world, learning their capabilities as they satisfy their needs. The invention of the wheel and the discovery of fire were decisive steps in human progress, making man's survival easier and his work more productive, and preparing for his enjoyment of extensive leisure. With his livelihood assured, man has progressively used his mind in pursuit of goodness, truth and beauty; and the generations have left to their successors a wealth of learning and skills. The Mediterranean peoples before the coming of Christ had high levels of attainment in learning and in all the arts; and we have built our own culture in large part out of what we inherited from them.

The Christian generations in Europe also have great achievements to compare with those of their predecessors. It is a matter of taste whether we prefer our own artistic treasures to theirs, in literature, painting, architecture, sculpture and the rest; and a comparison at that level would not justify a judgment that a culture is higher by reason of its Christianity: but that judgment can be substantiated if it is admitted that an essential element in culture is esteem of the person. Of all the cultures we have been considering, only those in Christian society are based on the law of charity and on the allied truth that every human being is of immeasurable value. Admittedly it has taken centuries for the law of charity to be honoured extensively in Christian

countries: but the non-Christian countries did not even know the law.

Is there any advantage or necessity in the continuation of Catholic schools? Would it not be better to merge them with other schools, just bringing in Catholic teachers to give religious lessons?

WHAT is the purpose of Catholic schools? It is to ground children in religious belief and practice, in co-operation with families. Can that purpose be attained in the way you suggest? What do you think religion is? It is much more than knowledge of the dogmatic and moral teaching of the Church, which could be imparted in class. The importance of a good family upbringing is acknowledged by everybody; and the good families are just the ones which want the support of Catholic schools. They all know that religion is a way of life, a direction to take, a choice in the depths of one's being which gives ideals and standards for all other choices. Religion means faith, hope and charity—a personal relationship with God in knowledge, trust and love. That relationship begins with God's initiative, and it requires a free human response. Faith, hope and charity cannot be taught as curriculum subjects. Their expression is prayer, a personal answer to the love of God. A habit of prayer can be taught, but only in a sharing of life. The best kind of teaching in any subject is the search for truth together by teacher and taught. For the most personal subject of all, that companionship is essential.

A case can be made for having Catholic primary schools to start children off well, and to let them go to state schools for the rest of their education. That system, it is argued, would make them come to a personal decision about religion under the stress of opposition and criticism from their contemporaries. But at their age they are not capable of making the right decision unsupported, especially as they would have to sustain blunt or subtle attacks on religion from some of their teachers.

Why should we praise God ?

PERHAPS your question arises out of the mingling of two uses of the word "praise". We normally mean by it approbation or commendation; and that seems to imply superiority in the one who praises. In keeping with that usage, the recipients of praise would be children and others under authority. The other meaning of the word, the only one that suits our relationship with God, is a combination of delight and thanksgiving.

Praising God does not mean condescension. The language of the psalms of praise conveys the right idea. We know the goodness of God through his creation and his providence; and we are astonished at God's power, and grateful for the benefits he bestows on us. Psalm 148, which is recited in the breviary on Sundays, makes the part of creation acknowledge the omnipotence and the kindness of God in making them; and it brings mankind as well into the chorus:

Praise him, sun and moon,
Praise him, shining stars.
Praise him, highest heavens
And the waters above the heavens.
Let them praise the name of the Lord.
He commanded: they were made.
All earth's kings and peoples,
Earth's princes and rulers,
Young men and maidens,
Old men together with children,
Let them praise the name of the Lord.

Praising God is an excellent kind of prayer; and we have endless opportunity for it if we will but notice the works of God, and glorify and thank their maker.

(The version of the psalm used above is from the *Grail Breviary Psalter* and is used with the permission of The Grail).

Book Review

MOSTLY ABOUT PLANNING

Public and Private Enterprise by John Jewkes; Routledge and Kegan Paul, 12s. 6d. **Human Values and the Economic System** by J. M. Jackson; Darton, Longman and Todd, 3s. **An Incomes Policy** by Colin Clarke; **Aims of Industry**, 2s. 6d.

FEW men have done more to dispose of the arguments in favour of centralised economic planning than Professor John Jewkes. His book, *Ordeal by Planning*, published shortly after the second world war was a classic. A more recent publication, *Private and Public Enterprise*, deserves a wider public than it will probably get. It will be confined, I am afraid, to a very small circle of readers. The reason is that Professor Jewkes is preaching an unpopular doctrine. In seeking to confine the economic activity of government to its appropriate place he is going clean contrary to the prevalent trend which accepts as normal massive government intervention in the economic and social life of this country.

The trend has grown stronger since the advent to power of Mr. Wilson and his associates. Nowadays the Government scoops up approximately £10,000 millions a year in taxes and duties of every kind. As Dr. Jackson points out in his admirable essay on *Human Values and the Economic System*, 40 per cent of Britain's gross national product is spent by central government and local authorities. It is clear that, under such circumstances, individual freedom of choice is constricted to a grave degree. More and more we are living by grace of government. Though few will question the need for government intervention in the interests of a more equitable distribution of income, a strong case can be made against the manner in which this is now being done and the waste attendant on its present operation. Stronger arguments still can be brought against the whole

notion that government should take to itself the increasingly centralised direction of this country's economic life. I am afraid they will not be heeded. For the time being this country is committed to state planning on an increasing scale. What Colin Clarke has described as the "crazy economics" of Professor Galbraith constitutes the official doctrine of those who walk the corridors of power. In-people in Britain today are planners. The rest of us are squares.

Yet, the reverse is the case just now in the Soviet Union. It is this that I find rather frightening. One wonders how foolish our politicians can be. After more than forty years of centralised state direction, of an economy planned on the false assumption that government knows better than the people themselves what is best for them, the Soviet Union is restoring the profit motive to economic life. It has to, for the cry in Russia today is for variety, for goods to satisfy the demand of a long-suffering public that drabness be removed from its life. The process really began when Stalin died. The old tyrant planned with a gun in his hand; building his country's economic infrastructure on the backs of a broken people. His successors lowered the gun; which meant that they had to take note of public opinion, governing by persuasion now instead of force, paying attention at last to their people's demand for the material elements of a decent existence. The logic of this is the restoration of economic incentive, the substitution of a price system for centralised planning, the gradual withdrawal, therefore, of government from the centre of economic life. This is what is happening now in the Soviet Union and its satellites. The governments of these countries have realised that a measure of economic freedom must accompany the first beginnings of its political counterpart. The alternatives are economic stagnation or state planning restored at the point of a gun. (Britain's economy is stagnating because we are still trying to plan without a gun; on a basis, that is, of exhortation to which people understandably will not respond: what we want, in other words, is to have our cake and eat it.) The great lesson of the Russian experience is that political freedom is incompatible with centralised state

planning. What frightens me is that we in this country do not appear to have noticed it. We still have our freedom but our economy is stagnant and we are moving steadily in the direction of a Wilsonian version of the Corporate State, a British brand of National Socialism. Our political leaders are committed to planning. One is entitled to ask for how much longer they will remain committed to freedom.

Professor Jewkes is no fanatic. He is opposed to centralised planning. At the same time, he is prepared to acknowledge that government has a part to play in economic life. Not the least of its duties in this respect is that of maintaining a stable currency. Needless to say, this is one of the things that post-war governments in this country have failed signally to do. Both parties have been guilty of standing Keynes on his head, bringing hardship and misery in the process to thousands and thousands of people. Not the least of the many merits of Dr. Jackson's excellent handbook is the balance he maintains throughout its sixty-three pages. He writes with great clarity and, at the same time, with such simple and enlightening informality that anyone, I think, should be able to understand what he has to say and his reasons for saying it. A perfect example of this happy approach is found in the way in which, in a couple of short pages, he sets out the essentials of the Keynesian approach to contemporary economic problems. I have read his booklet twice. Whilst doing so, I could not help contrasting his whole manner of presentation, clarity of style and easy mastery of subject-matter with the convoluted obscurantism that marks the present outpourings of the Catholic Left. Yet, they are getting the headlines at the moment; and the youngsters will be led up the garden path by the attempt of the Slant Group to identify the Church with a socialist society. Slant writers will brush aside Dr. Jackson with contempt as an uncommitted don whose thinking is conditioned by his bourgeois environment. If only they knew! The trouble, I think, is that Slant writers do not really want to know. Knowledge hurts when it destroys preciously preconceived theories.

Paul Crane, S.J.